



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,330	02/02/2006	Kim Borch	10312.204-US	5006
25908 7590 09/17/2008 NOVOZYMES NORTH AMERICA, INC. 500 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 1600 NEW YORK, NY 10110				
EXAMINER				
BADR, HAMID R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,330

Applicant(s)

BORCH ET AL.

Examiner

HAMID R. BADR

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF 298)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4 and 5 are objected to for "of the preceding claim" given it is not clear what claim is being referred to. The phrase "of the preceding claim" must be changed to "as in any one of the preceding claims", "as in any of the preceding claims" or "as in any preceding claim" as set forth in MPEP 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the baked product" in the composition. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Negishi et al. (JP 2622563; hereinafter R1) in view of JP 58190346 A (hereinafter R2) and Inoue et al. (US 4,567,046; hereinafter R3)

3. R1 discloses the use of lipoxygenase in an amount of 50-500 unit per gram of wheat flour. R1 discloses that such a flour will bring about an increase in the volume of bread and its whiteness. Bread of high quality is produced using the flour (Abstract).
4. R1 gives an example of mixing the lipoxygenase and flour so that the flour contains about 100 units of the activity of the enzyme. The prepared flour is then used in bread making by the straight dough method (page 4, machine translation, Example 1).
- 1). R1 gives the improved characteristics of the baked bread containing lipoxygenase in Table 2, page 5 (machine translation).
5. R1 is silent regarding the use of a lipolytic enzyme active on polar lipids in a dough.
6. R2 discloses use of lipoxygenase together with lisophosphatidine (LPA) which is enzymatically prepared from soybean lecithin, its salt or the phospholipid mixture having high LPA content in flour which is made into a dough (Abstract).
7. R2 discloses that the inventive composition improves the specific volume, appearance and the texture of the baked bread.
8. R2 is silent regarding the addition of a lipolytic enzyme active on polar lipids in a dough.
9. R3 discloses the use of soybean lecithin and emulsifiers in combination with phospholipase A (PL-A) (Col. 3, lines 23-30). It is noted that this enzyme is a lipolytic enzyme active on polar lipids such as phospholipids.

10. R3 teaches that the bread improver (containing phospholipase A) can be used in the production of bread by either the sponge dough process or the straight process (col. 3, lines 35-38).

11. R3 discloses that phospholipase A (PL-A) is usually added to the ingredients of dough for bread prior to the mixing thereof. Alternatively PL-A may be mixed with either wheat flour or a bakers flour mix containing various auxiliary ingredients. The alternative method has the advantage in that the need for weighing PL-A and adding a suitable amount of PL-A to the ingredient of dough every time the bread-making is done is saved , and a gradual enzymatic reaction is performed during storage (Col. 2, lines 57-65).

Limitations of claims 4 and 5 are thus met.

12. R3 discloses that the bread produced according to the inventive process has a large volume and is suitably soft. The bread can also be stored for a prolonged period without undergoing much staling (Col. 4, lines 8-13).

13. Given that R1 discloses using lipoxxygenase to bring about an increase in the volume of the bread as well as its whiteness and R3 discloses using phospholipids in order to produce bread with large volume that is suitably soft and does not stale for prolonged periods, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the lipoxxygenase and phospholipids in synergistic amounts to produce bread with optimal volume while still possessing optimal whiteness, softness, and anti-staling properties.

14. R1 and R2 are clearly teaching the combination of lipoxxygenase and a hydrolyzed phospholipid such as lisophosphotidine (LPA) and the effect of this

combination in improving the volume, texture and color of the baked bread. R3 is clearly teaching that a phospholipase can be included in a lecithin containing formulation. It is obvious that the enzymatically prepared LPA that is taught by R2, can be clearly prepared by incorporating a phospholipase into the dough containing lecithin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine a lipoxygenase and a lipolytic enzyme active on polar lipids to bring about improved properties of the baked products. Absent any evidence to contrary and based on the combined teachings of the cited references there would be a reasonable expectation of success in creating such a combination of enzymes for the purpose of improved bread quality.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAMID R. BADR whose telephone number is (571)270-3455. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 5:00 to 3:30 (Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on (571) 272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hamid R Badr
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Callie E. Shosho/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794